#### DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 450 859 JC 010 245

AUTHOR Curtis, John W.

TITLE Germanna Community College Transfer Student Success,

1990-99: Revised Tables.

INSTITUTION Germanna Community Coll., Locust Grove, VA.

PUB DATE 2000-09-00

NOTE 14p.

PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS \*Academic Persistence; \*College Transfer Students; Community

Colleges; \*Enrollment; Higher Education; Institutional

Characteristics; Outcomes of Education; \*Student

Characteristics; Two Year College Students

IDENTIFIERS \*Germanna Community College VA

#### ABSTRACT

This report presents information on students who attended Germanna Community College and applied to one of the public baccalaureate institutions in Virginia between the years of 1990 and 1999. Admission, enrollment, and success after transfer are all analyzed. However, the tables are incomplete because not all colleges submitted the necessary data. Thus, some differences in tables may be due to this lack of information, rather than actual differences in transfer success. Highlights include: (1) 1,384 Germanna students applied to four-year institutions during this ten-year period, including 269 to Virginia Commonwealth University, 227 to James Madison University, and 166 to George Mason University; (2) 90% of these applicants were white, 5.3% were African-American, 2% were Asian, 1.3% Hispanic, and 1.4% "other"; (3) 59.8% of the applicants were female; (4) Virginia Commonwealth University appears to have admitted the highest number of applicants: 211; (5) one year after transferring, 80% (n=125) of the students at Virginia Commonwealth University were in good standing, compared with only 67% (n=76) at George Mason University; and (6) in total, 79% (n=748) of all students who transferred to a four-year institution were in good standing. Where a university code was not provided, "good standing" was defined as a grade point average (GPA) of at least 2.0. (CJW)



# Germanna Community College Transfer Student Success, 1990-99: Revised Tables

John W. Curtis September 2000

> PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION Office of Educational Research and Improvement EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

- ☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

**BEST COPY AVAILABLE** 



## Germanna Community College

#### Transfer Student Success, 1990-99: Revised Tables

John W. Curtis, Director of Institutional Research and Planning September 2000

This report presents information on students who attended Germanna and applied to one of the public baccalaureate institutions in Virginia between 1990 and 1999. The report provides information on admission, enrollment, and success after transfer. All data presented in this report is based on information supplied by the transfer institutions. These tables are incomplete, however, because the two most significant transfer institutions (James Madison University and Mary Washington College) do not supply information on students who applied, but did not enroll. Other institutions may have restricted the information supplied to students who had completed a certain number of credits, or to students who gave their permission. Only two institutions have supplied data for the 1999-2000 year. Therefore, some differences in the following tables may be due to gaps in the information supplied by the transfer colleges, rather than actual differences in transfer student success.

#### Section I – Transfer Admission and Enrollment

Table 1.

Descriptive characteristics of transfer applicants, 1990-99

Transfer School	Years of Data	Number	elen il in terres de
College of William and Mary	8	17	1.2%
Christopher Newport University	3	9	0.7%
George Mason University	7	166	12.0%
James Madison University*	9	227	16.4%
Mary Washington College*	6	181	13.1%
Old Dominion University	6	109	7.9%
Radford University	7	181	13.1%
University of Virginia	5	53	3.8%
University of Virginia-Wise	5	12	0.9%
Virginia Commonwealth University	9	269	19.4%
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	9	160	11.6%
All transfer applicants	s	1384	100.1 %



\*Note: James Madison University and Mary Washington College did not provide data on non-enrollees.

Table 1. (Continued)
Descriptive characteristics of transfer applicants, 1990-99

#### Race/Ethnicity

White	1245	90.0%	GCC Graduate	600	43.4%
African-American	73	5.3%	GCC Non-Graduate	784	56.6%
Asian	28	2.0%	CCC Durant		
Hispanic	18	1.3%	GCC Program		
Other	20	1.4%	Transfer	693	50.1%
Other	20	1.470	Occupational	94	6.8%
Female	827	59.8%	Unclassified	597	43.1%
Male	557	40.2%	*Totals may not add to 100% d	ue to round	ding.

Analysis – According to the available data, and correcting for incomplete reporting, the primary destinations for Germanna transfer applicants are (in order): Mary Washington College; VCU; James Madison U.; Radford U.; and George Mason U. The significance of this tabulation is that Mary Washington is no longer the nearly exclusive destination for Germanna transfer students that it may have been in previous years.

Minority students are underrepresented among the transfer applicants, as they make up approximately 15% of the overall Germanna student body but only 10% of transfer applicants. Women are also somewhat underrepresented. Significantly in terms of advising, the majority of transfer applicants did *not* graduate from Germanna, and nearly half were *not* enrolled in transfer degree programs.



Table 2.
Acceptance and enrollment rates for transfer applicants, 1990-99

Transfer School	Applied	Admi	tted	Enro	lled
College of William and Mary	17	9	52.9%	4	23.5%
Christopher Newport University	9	8	88.9%	7	77.8%
George Mason University	166	141	85.0%	113	68.1%
James Madison University*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	227	n.a.
Mary Washington College*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	181	n.a.
Old Dominion University	109	102	93.6%	60	55.0%
Radford University	181	153	85.6%	98	54.1%
University of Virginia	53	37	69.8%	31	58.5%
University of Virginia-Wise	12	11	91.7%	7	58.3%
Virginia Commonwealth University	269	211	78.4%	152	56.5%
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	160	67	41.9%	64	40.0%
All transfer applicants	976	741	75.9%	536	54.9%

<sup>\*</sup>Note: James Madison University and Mary Washington College did not provide data on non-enrollees; their enrollees are listed here for informational purposes only, and are not included in the overall admission rate. Not all institutions provided data for all years.

Analysis – The admission rate analysis is seriously limited, in that two primary application destinations (Mary Washington College and James Madison U.) did not provide data on students who applied but did not enroll. Table 2 shows that approximately 76% of transfer applicants were accepted at the institutions which provided data. Acceptance rates for The University of Virginia and Virginia Tech were lower.

Table 3.
Acceptance and enrollment rates,
by applicant race/ethnicity

Race/Ethnicity	Applied	Admi	itted	Enro	lled
White	867	655	75.5%	470	54.2%
Other	109	86	78.9%	66	60.6%
All applicant	s 976	741	75.9%	536	54.9%

<sup>\*</sup>Note: Tables in this section include data only from the senior colleges which provided student identifiable data for both enrollees and non-enrollees, allowing for a match with GCC enrollment data.



Analysis – Table 3 does not indicate a significant difference in transfer admission rates by the applicant's racial or ethnic background ( $O^2$  test at p < .05). (Categories other than "White" were combined for the statistical analysis due to the small number of cases.)

Table 4.
Acceptance and enrollment rates,
by applicant gender

Gender	Applied	Admitted	Enrolled
Female	555	437 78.7%	304 54.8%
Male	421	304 72.2%	232 55.1%
All applicants	976	741 75.9%	536 54.9%

Analysis – Table 4 indicates that female applicants were more likely to be accepted for admission. This difference is statistically significant, although it is not large. Enrollment rates were virtually identical.

Table 5.
Acceptance and enrollment rates,
by Germanna Graduate Status

Germanna Graduate Status	Applied	Admi	tted	Enro	lled
Graduate	417	319	76.5%	217	52.0%
Non-Graduate	559	422	75.5%	319	57.1%
All transfer applicants	976	741	75.9%	536	54.9%

Analysis – Table 5 does not indicate a statistically significant difference in transfer admission rates by Germanna graduate status. However, this is a significant negative finding, in that students who graduated were *not* more likely to be accepted. A more definitive analysis is presented in Table 7 below, where graduation status is combined with the type of curriculum.



Table 6.
Acceptance and enrollment rates,
by Germanna program

Germanna Program	Applied	Admi	tted	Enro	lled
Transfer	506	372	73.5%	260	51.4%
Occupational	92	73	79.3%	51	55.4%
Unclassified	378	296	78.3%	225	59.5%
All transfer applicants	976	741	75.9%	536	54.9%

<sup>\*</sup>Note: This table includes data only from the senior colleges which provided student identifiable data for both enrollees and non-enrollees, allowing for a match with GCC enrollment data. "Occupational" includes certificate programs.

Analysis – Table 6 indicates that transfer admission acceptance rates were essentially equivalent for applicants enrolled in all three types of Germanna programs. The differences shown in the table are not statistically significant. However, this table does not include consideration of whether the student graduated from Germanna, a factor which is added into Table 7.

Table 7.
Transfer admission and enrollment,
by Germanna program and graduate status

Superior Section 2		Gr	aduate	_ =	. +≠ .		Non-	Gradua	tes	<u></u>
GCC Program	Applied	Adm	itted	Enr	olled	Applied	Adn	nitted	Enr	olled
Transfer	274	202	73.7%	133	48.5%	232	170	73.2%	127	54.7%
Occupational	65	55	84.7%	38	58.5%	27	18	66.6%	13	48.1%
Unclassified	78	62	79.5%	46	59.0%	300	234	78.0%	179	59.7%
All applicants	417	319	76.5%	217	52.0%	559	422	75.5%	319	57.1%

<sup>\*</sup>Note: This table includes data only from the senior colleges which provided student identifiable data for both enrollees and non-enrollees, allowing for a match with Germanna enrollment data. "Occupational" includes certificate programs.

Analysis – Combining the effect of Germanna graduation and curriculum, Table 7 produces one specific difference in admission rates. Among occupational students, those who graduated



were more successful in gaining admission, and more likely to enroll. This was not the case among transfer graduates, which is another important negative finding.



Transfer admission and enrollment, by GCC graduate status Table 8.

		229	GCC Graduates	tes		<b>O</b> .	3CC No	GCC Non-Graduates	lates	
Transfer School	Applied	Adm	Admitted	Enrolled	lled	Applied	Admitted	itted	Enrolled	lled
College of William and Mary	11	4	36.4%		9.1%	9	5	83.3%	c	50.0%
Christopher Newport University	- CI	2	100%	2	100%	7	9	85.7%	5	71.4%
George Mason University	95	83	87.4%	64	67.4%	71	58	81.7%	49	%0.69
James Madison University*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	38*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	189*	n.a.
Mary Washington College*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	144*	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	n.a.	37*	n.a.
Old Dominion University	26	54	96.4%	33	58.9%	53	48	%9:06	27	50.9%
Radford University	42	39	92.9%	16	38.1%	139	116	83.5%	82	29.0%
University of Virginia	29	22	75.8%	17	%9.85	24	15	62.5%	14	58.3%
University of Virginia-Wise	·· <b>co</b> ) ·	æ	100%	2	%2.99	6	∞	88.9%	5	%9.55
Virginia Commonwealth University	107	81	75.7%	55	51.4%	162	130	80.2%	67	%6.65
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	67	27	40.3%	25	37.3%	93	40	43.0%	39	41.9%
All transfer applicants	417	319	319 76.5%	217	217 52.0%	559	422	75.5%	319	319 57.1%

\*Note: James Madison University and Mary Washington College did not provide data on non-enrollees; their enrollees are listed here for informational purposes only, and are not included in the overall admission rate. Not all institutions provided data for all years.

more likely to be admitted than were non-graduates at George Mason, ODU, University of Virginia, and Radford. However, graduates Table 8 indicates some specific difference between institutions in the admission of Germanna transfers. Graduates were somewhat were not more likely to be admitted at Virginia Tech or VCU. Based on the incomplete data provided, transfers to JMU were primarily non-graduates, while transfers to Mary Washington were primarily graduates.

#### Section II – Academic Status After Transfer

The tables in this section include data only from the students who actually enrolled at a senior college, matched with their Germanna enrollment history. This section presents two indicators of academic status after transfer, academic standing and GPA.

Table 9.
Academic status one year after transfer\*

Transfer School	Enrolled	In Go Stand	
College of William and Mary	4	4	100%
Christopher Newport University	7	7	100%
George Mason University	113	76	67.3%
James Madison University	227	197	86.8%
Mary Washington College	181	136	75.1%
Old Dominion University	60	43	71.7%
Radford University	99	77	77.8%
University of Virginia	31	27	87.1%
University of Virginia-Wise	7	6	85.7%
Virginia Commonwealth University	155	125	80.6%
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	64	50	78.1%
All transfer students	948	748	78.9%

<sup>\*</sup>Note: Academic standing is defined by the transfer institution; however, most institutions did not provide an actual "academic standing" code in their data. Where this is not provided, "Good Standing" is defined as a GPA of at least 2.00 at the transfer institution. Academic standing is for the first year of transfer enrollment wherever possible.

Analysis – One indicator of success after transfer is the student's academic status after completing one year at the destination institution. However, most transfer institutions do not supply an actual data element regarding academic standing; a GPA of 2.00 is used here as a proxy for "good standing". Overall, Table 9 indicates that 79% of Germanna transfer enrollees were in good standing one year after transfer. At JMU and the University of Virginia, 87% were in good standing. Success rates at ODU (72%) and George Mason (67%) were slightly lower than others.



Table 10.
Academic status one year after transfer,
by Germanna Graduate Status

Germanna Gra	duate Status	Good St	anding	Not G Stand	
Graduate		316	79.0%	84	21.0%
Non-Graduate		432	78.8%	116	21.2%
	All transfer students	748	78.9%	200	21.1%

Analysis – Table 10 indicates that non-graduates were just as likely as graduates to maintain good standing one year after transfer.

Table 11. Academic status one year after transfer, by GCC graduate status

	GCC Graduates In Good		GCC Non-Graduates In Good			
Transfer School	Enrolled		Standing		Stand	
College of William and Mary	1	1	100%	3	3	100%
Christopher Newport University	2	2	100%	5	. 5	100%
George Mason University	64	46	71.9%	49	30	61.2%
James Madison University	38	34	89.5%	189	163	86.2%
Mary Washington College	144	112	77.8%	37	24	64.9%
Old Dominion University	33	23	69.7%	27	20	74.1%
Radford University	16	13	81.3%	83	64	77.1%
University of Virginia	17	15	88.2%	14	12	85.7%
University of Virginia-Wise	2	1	50.0%	5	5	100%
Virginia Commonwealth University	55	49	89.1%	100	76	76.0%
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	25	19	76.0%	39	31	79.5%
All transfer students	400	316	79.0%	548	432	78.8%

Analysis – Overall, graduates and non-graduates showed nearly identical success rates on academic standing after transfer. However, graduates fared somewhat better than non-graduates after one year at George Mason, Mary Washington, and VCU.



Table 12. Academic status one year after transfer, by GCC program and graduate status

GCC Program	Enrolled	In Good	Standing
Transfer	447	343	76.7%
Occupational	53	44	83.0%
Unclassified	444	357	80.4%
All transfers	944	744	78.8%

GCC Program	GCC Graduates In Good Enrolled Standing			GCC Non-Graduates In Good Enrolled Standing			
Transfer	275	214	77.8%	172	129	75.0%	
Occupational	39	34	87.2%	14	10	71.4%	
Unclassified	86	68	79.1%	358	289	80.7%	
All transfers	400	316	79.0%	544	428	78.7%	

Analysis – Although Table 12 shows slight differences between program categories in the proportion of students in good standing after transfer, the differences do not demosntrate a clear pattern and are not statistically significant. When combined with gaduate status, however, one difference does emerge, and it is parallel to that shown in Table 7 for admission: Occupational students who graduated were more likely to maintain good academic standing than were occupational non-graduates.



Table 13.
Academic status (GPA) one year after transfer

	GCC Graduates GCC Transfer			GCC Non-Graduates GCC Transfer		
Transfer School	GPA	GPA	N	GPA	GPA	N
College of William and Mary	3.96	2.95	1	3.93	3.02	3
Christopher Newport University	2.98	2.78	2	3.14	3.08	5
George Mason University	3.11	2.50	64	2.86	2.29	49
James Madison University	3.39	1.43	38	3.15	2.08	189
Mary Washington College	3.30	2.43	144	3.34	2.27	37
Old Dominion University	2.93	2.74	33	3.04	2.48	27
Radford University	2.78	2.60	16	2.59	2.25	83
University of Virginia	3.57	2.32	17	3.36	2.87	14
University of Virginia-Wise	2.93	2.88	2	3.08	2.84	5
Virginia Commonwealth University	3.28	2.94	55	3.06	2.43	100
Virginia Tech (VPISU)	3.24	2.48	25	3.27	2.47	39
All transfer students	3.23	2.45	400	3.04	2.29	548

Analysis – Table 13 indicates that most students experienced a decline in GPA after transfer, as much as one point. The average decline for graduates was 0.79, for non-graduates 0.76. Declines within this range during the first year can be considered a "normal" part of the transfer experience. Among graduates, the largest declines were at JMU (1.96) and University of Virginia (1.25). Among non-graduates, the largest declines were at JMU (1.07) and Mary Washington (1.07). Graduates at ODU, Radford, and VCU experienced smaller declines.





### U.S. Department of Education

Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)



## **NOTICE**

# **Reproduction Basis**



This document is covered by a signed "Reproduction Release (Blanket)" form (on file within the ERIC system), encompassing all or classes of documents from its source organization and, therefore, does not require a "Specific Document" Release form.



This document is Federally-funded, or carries its own permission to reproduce, or is otherwise in the public domain and, therefore, may be reproduced by ERIC without a signed Reproduction Release form (either "Specific Document" or "Blanket").

EFF-089 (3/2000)

